

# Constrained Learning with Non-Convex Losses

Luiz F. O. Chamon, Santiago Paternain, Miguel Calvo-Fullana, and Alejandro Ribeiro

**Abstract**—Though learning has become a core technology of modern information processing, there is now ample evidence that it can lead to biased, unsafe, and prejudiced solutions. The need to impose requirements on learning is therefore paramount, especially as it reaches critical applications in social, industrial, and medical domains. However, the non-convexity of most modern learning problems is only exacerbated by the introduction of constraints. Whereas good unconstrained solutions can often be learned using empirical risk minimization (ERM), even obtaining a model that satisfies statistical constraints can be challenging, all the more so a good one. In this paper, we overcome this issue by learning in the empirical dual domain, where constrained statistical learning problems become unconstrained, finite dimensional, and deterministic. We analyze the generalization properties of this approach by bounding the empirical duality gap, i.e., the difference between our approximate, tractable solution and the solution of the original (non-convex) statistical problem, and provide a practical constrained learning algorithm. These results establish a constrained counterpart of classical learning theory and enable the explicit use of constraints in learning. We illustrate this algorithm and theory in rate-constrained learning applications.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Learning is at the core of the modern information systems upon which we increasingly rely to select job candidates, analyze medical data, and control “smart” applications (home, grid, city). Central to this approach is the concept of empirical risk minimization (ERM), in which a statistical (expected value) optimization problem is replaced by its empirical (sample average) counterpart, thus allowing it to be solved from data, without knowledge of the underlying distributions [3]–[5]. This approach is grounded on celebrated generalization results from learning [3]–[5] and stochastic optimization [6], [7] theory showing that under mild conditions, the ERM solutions are close to their statistical analog for large enough samples sizes.

As these systems become ubiquitous, however, so does the need to constrain their behavior to tackle fairness [8]–[13], robustness [14]–[16], and safety [17]–[19] problems. Left untethered, learning can lead to biased, prejudiced models prone to tampering (e.g., adversarial examples) and unsafe behaviors [20]–[23]. Learning constraints can also be used to incorporate prior knowledge, such as smoothness or sparsity [24]–[26], and tackle semi-supervised problems [27], [28].

Learning requirements are often imposed using regularization, i.e., by integrating constraint violation penalties in the ERM objective (see, e.g., [15], [29]–[32]). Yet, while it is straightforward to find penalties leading to feasible, optimal solutions when the ERM problem is convex, most

modern parametrizations (e.g., convolutional neural networks, CNNs) lead to non-convex optimization problems. Designing good penalties then becomes a time-consuming trial-and-error process based on domain expert knowledge that need not yield feasible solutions, all the more so good ones [33]. While algorithms inspired by primal-dual methods have been applied in practice, no guarantees can be given for their outcome in general [14], [16], [34], [35]. What is more, classical learning theory guarantees generalization with respect to the regularized objective and not the requirements it describes [3]–[5]. This issue is sometimes addressed by constructing models that explicitly *embed* the required properties (e.g., [36]–[40]), although the scale and opacity of modern machine learning (ML) systems typically render this approach impractical.

Since learning is often synonymous with ERM, a natural solution is to explicitly add constraints to these optimization problems. Given that requirements are often expressed as constraints in the first place, this approach guarantees that any solution satisfies the requirements without the need to tune regularization parameters. While constraints have been deployed in statistics since Neyman-Pearson [41], two roadblocks hinder their use in modern learning problems. First, typical parametrizations (e.g., neural networks) lead to non-convex constrained optimization problems, which from an algorithmic standpoint are considerably harder than their unconstrained counterparts. While gradient descent can sometimes be used to approximately minimize a loss function even if it is non-convex [42]–[45], it does not guarantee feasibility.

Second, even if we could solve this constrained ERM problem, the generalization guarantees exist only in specific contexts, e.g., for coherence constraints or rate-constrained learning [8], [9], [13], [46]–[50]. Indeed, classical learning theory is concerned with unconstrained learning problems [3]–[5]. Results for general constrained stochastic programs are often asymptotic, considering only the randomness of the feasibility set [49], [51]–[53] or involve a myriad of distributional assumptions [47], [48], [50], [54]–[56]. More recent guarantees rely on particular algorithms and hold only for randomized solutions, e.g., [8], [9], [11], [13].

This paper addresses these issues by building off the constrained statistical learning theory developed in [2] to provide generalization guarantees for a large class of constrained learning problems. In particular, it bounds the empirical duality gap of constrained learning, i.e., the difference between the optimal value of the constrained, statistical problem and that of an unconstrained, deterministic problem. In contrast to previous works, however, it accounts for non-convex losses and thus provides deterministic guarantees for the empirical solution of, e.g., rate-constrained problems. Still, obtaining such deterministic solutions remains intricate. Nevertheless, we show that dual ascent methods can be used to obtain near-

Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, University of Pennsylvania. e-mail: {luizf, spater, cfullana, aribeiro}@seas.upenn.edu.

Part of the results in this paper appeared in [1], [2].

optimal and near-feasible randomized solutions.

We approach this result in three steps. First, we show that, under mild conditions, constrained statistical learning has zero *duality gap* (Section III-A). In contrast to [1], [2] that only considered convex losses, we make no such assumptions. The original statistical learning problem may therefore be non-convex even before it is parameterized, precluding the use of classical duality results. We overcome this challenge using recent results from non-convex functional optimization [57]. We then proceed to bound the *parameterization gap*, i.e., the loss of optimality due to approximating the constrained learning problem by an unconstrained (dual) problem solved using a finite dimensional parameterization of the original functional space (Section III-B). Finally, we analyze the *empirical gap*, i.e., the error due to the use of samples instead of the unknown data distributions (Section III-C). The final bound (Theorem 2) depends not only on the number of samples, but also on the difficulty of the statistical problem both in terms of the parametrization and how hard its constraints are to satisfy. It also reveals that, under mild conditions, the presence of non-convex losses have negligible impact on the statistical complexity of constrained learning. We conclude by showcasing practical applications of constrained learning.

## II. A CONSTRAINED LEARNING PRIMER

Let  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , denote probability distributions over data pairs  $(\mathbf{x}, y)$ , with  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a function associated with the parameter vector  $\theta \in \Theta$ , for a compact set  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . The hypothesis class induced by these functions is denoted  $\mathcal{H} = \{f_\theta \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$ . For convenience, we can interpret  $\mathbf{x}$  as a feature vector or a system input,  $y$  as a label or a measurement, and  $f_\theta$  as a parametrized classifier or estimator. In classification problems,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a finite set, typically a subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ , whereas it is uncountable in the case of regression/estimation.

The constrained learning problem is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} P^* &= \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} [\ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ \text{subject to } &\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i, \quad (\text{P-CSL}) \\ &i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, B]$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , are bounded functions that, together with the  $c_i$ , encode performance metrics and the desired statistical properties of the solution. In general, we think of  $\mathcal{D}_0$  as a nominal joint distribution and the additional  $\mathcal{D}_i$  as different conditional distributions over which requirements are imposed (see Section V). Contrary to previous works [1], [2], we do not assume that the  $\ell_i$  are convex.

Before proceeding, it is worth distinguishing between parameter constraints, such as quadratic regularization ( $\|\theta\|_2 \leq c$ ) or sparsity ( $\|\theta\|_1 \leq c$ ) and the statistical constraints in (P-CSL). The former, embodied here by  $\Theta$ , are deterministic conditions that can be imposed directly, whereas the latter depend on distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$  that we assume unknown. The goal of constrained learning theory is to establish when and how (P-CSL) can be solved using only samples from the  $\mathcal{D}_i$  as classical learning theory does for unconstrained learning.

### A. PAC learning

The unconstrained version of (P-CSL), namely

$$P_{\mathcal{U}}^* = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} [\ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)], \quad (\text{PI})$$

is at the core of celebrated Bayesian estimators, such as Kalman filters, and virtually every modern learning algorithm [4], [58], [59]. Classical learning theory studies the conditions under which (PI) can be solved based only on samples from  $\mathcal{D}_0$ , i.e., without the knowledge of the distribution itself. When the hypothesis class induced by the parametrization  $\mathcal{H}$  allows  $P_{\mathcal{U}}^*$  to be approximated arbitrarily well and with arbitrarily high probability given enough samples, it is said to be *probably approximately correct (PAC) learnable* [3], [4], [60], [61].

**Definition 1 (PAC learnability).** A hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  is (*agnostic*) *probably approximately correct (PAC) learnable* with respect to the loss  $\ell_0$  if for every  $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$  and every distribution  $\mathcal{D}_0$ ,  $f_\theta \in \mathcal{H}$  can be obtained from  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon, \delta)$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}_0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P_{\mathcal{U}}^* + \epsilon$  with probability  $1 - \delta$ .

PAC learnability limits the complexity of a hypothesis class: the richer  $\mathcal{H}$  is, the more samples are required to pinpoint a hypothesis that has small error on the entire distribution. Different complexity measures exist that allow us to determine whether a hypothesis class is learnable or not. Though our results will not depend on a specific one, we introduce two well-known measures below which we use to illustrate our results.

Consider the sample set  $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$  and the set  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{S}$  the set of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$  achievable by applying the functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  to the samples in  $\mathcal{S}$ , namely

$$\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{S} = \left\{ [f(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1) \cdots f(\mathbf{x}_{|\mathcal{S}|}, y_{|\mathcal{S}|})]^T \mid f \in \mathcal{F} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Both the VC dimension (Definition 2) and the Rademacher complexity (Definition 3) characterize the learning complexity of  $\mathcal{H}$  in terms of the size of the set  $(\ell \circ \mathcal{H}) \circ \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\ell \circ \mathcal{H}$  is used to denote the set of functions  $\{\ell(h(\cdot), \cdot) \mid h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . The former does so in a combinatorial, worst-case sense, whereas the latter does so on average.

**Definition 2 (VC dimension [3, Section 3.6]).** The *VC dimension* of a hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to the loss  $\ell$  is defined as

$$d_{\text{VC}} = \max\{m : \Pi(m) = 2^m\} \quad (2)$$

for the *growth function*  $\Pi(m) = \max_{|\mathcal{S}|=m} |(\mathcal{T} \circ \ell \circ \mathcal{H}) \circ \mathcal{S}|$ , where  $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbb{I}(\cdot) - b \mid b \in (0, B)\}$  is a set of threshold functions and  $\mathbb{I}(z)$  denotes the indicator function that is one if  $z > 0$  and zero otherwise.

**Definition 3 (Rademacher complexity [62] [5, Def. 3.1–3.2]).** The *Rademacher complexity* of a hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to the loss  $\ell$  and the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined as

$$R_N = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S} \sim \mathcal{D}^N} \left[ \hat{R}((\ell \circ \mathcal{H}) \circ \mathcal{S}) \right] \quad (3)$$

for the *empirical Rademacher complexity*  $\hat{R}$  defined for any set of vectors  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  as

$$\hat{R}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[ \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma_n a_n \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a random vector whose elements  $\sigma_n$  are drawn i.i.d. according to  $\Pr[\sigma_n = +1] = \Pr[\sigma_n = -1] = 1/2$ .

A fundamental result in learning theory states that for binary classification problems,  $\mathcal{H}$  is PAC learnable with respect to the 0/1-loss if and only if it has finite VC dimension. In this case, ERM yields a PAC solution of (PI) (see, e.g., [4, Thm. 6.7]). In other words, we can simply replace the expectation by an average over samples from  $\mathcal{D}_0$ . While this equivalence does not hold in general, Definitions 2 and 3 can be used to bound the sample complexity  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon, \delta)$  of different learning tasks (e.g., Proposition 1). Note that the Rademacher complexity depends on the distribution of the data while PAC learnability does not. Yet, it is often the case that distribution-independent upper bounds can be found for  $R_N$  [4], [5].

In constrained learning, however, it is not enough to approximate the value  $P^*$ , since solutions must also satisfy the constraints in (P-CSL). In fact, feasibility often takes priority over performance in constrained problems. Regardless of how accurate a *fair* classifier is, it serves no practical purpose unless it meets fairness requirements (see Section V). Hence, PAC learning is not sufficiently strict to address the problem of learning under requirements. In the sequel, we summarize the constrained learning framework put forward in [2].

### B. Probably approximately correct constrained learning

A key challenge that hinders the solution of (P-CSL) in practice is the fact that we cannot evaluate its expectations without knowledge of the  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . Hence, we cannot expect to solve (P-CSL) exactly and must settle, as in classical learning theory, for a *good enough* solution. The following definition establishes what is considered “good enough” for a constrained learning problem.

**Definition 4** (Near-PACC learnability [2, Def. 2]). A hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  is *nearly probably approximately correct constrained (near-PACC)* learnable with respect to  $\ell_0, \{(\ell_i, c_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, m}$  if there exists  $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$  such that for every  $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$  and every distribution  $\mathcal{D}_i, i = 0, \dots, m$ , we can obtain a  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$  using  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon, \delta)$  samples from each  $\mathcal{D}_i$  that is, with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

1) probably approximately optimal, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} [\ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P^* + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon, \text{ and} \quad (5)$$

2) probably approximately feasible, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \epsilon, \text{ for all } i. \quad (6)$$

Definition 4 is an extension of the PAC framework from classical learning theory to the problem of learning under requirements. Indeed, for  $\epsilon_0 = 0$ , (5) is the classical definition of (agnostic) PAC learnability (Definition 1). This is, however, not enough to enable constrained learning since a PAC  $\phi$

may not be feasible for (P-CSL). Hence, a PACC learner must also satisfy the approximate feasibility condition (6). The additional “C” in PACC serves to remind ourselves of this fact. Unless explicitly necessary, we often omit the reference to the losses  $\ell_i$  and slacks  $c_i$ .

Notice that the factor  $\epsilon_0$  is independent of the distributions and affects only the value of the problem, i.e., it does not interfere with either the sample complexity  $N_{\mathcal{H}}$  or the constraint satisfaction (6). It characterizes an intrinsic limitation of the learning task (P-CSL) due to the use of the parametrization  $f_{\theta}$  and is related to what is often known in classical learning theory as the *approximation error*. In contrast to unconstrained learning, however, it is coupled to the learning problem due to the presence constraints and can no longer be treated as a separate source of error [4]. When  $\epsilon_0 = 0$ , we simply say that  $\mathcal{H}$  is *PACC learnable*.

Having established *what* learning under requirements is, we proceed to the question of *when* it can be done. As it turns out, PACC learning is essentially as hard as PAC learning.

**Theorem 1.** *If the hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  is PAC learnable with respect to each  $\ell_i, i = 0, \dots, m$ , then it is PACC learnable with respect to  $\ell_0, \{(\ell_i, c_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, m}$  for  $c_i \geq P_i^* \triangleq \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)]$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\mathcal{H}$  is PACC learnable if Definition 4 holds for  $\epsilon_0 = 0$ . Namely, we need to show that for every  $(\epsilon, \delta) \in (0, 1)$  and regardless of the distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , we can obtain  $f_{\theta} \in \mathcal{H}$  from  $\bar{N}(\epsilon, \delta)$  samples of each  $\mathcal{D}_i$  such that

$$\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{i=0}^m \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \epsilon \right\} \right] > 1 - \delta, \quad (7)$$

with  $c_0 = P^* \geq P_0^*$ . To do so, start by using the union bound to obtain

$$\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{i=0}^m \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \epsilon \right\} \right] > 1 - \sum_{i=0}^m \Pr [\mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \epsilon].$$

Then, noticing that the event  $\{\mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P_i^*\}$  is contained in  $\{\mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i\}$  for all  $c_i \geq P_i^*$  yields

$$\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{i=0}^m \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \epsilon \right\} \right] > 1 - \sum_{i=0}^m \Pr [\mathbb{E} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P_i^* + \epsilon]. \quad (8)$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is PAC learnable with respect to each  $\ell_i$  (see Definition 1), there exists  $N_i$  such that the probability on the right-hand side of (8) is at most  $\delta/(m+1)$ . Taking  $\bar{N}(\epsilon, \delta) = \max_i N_i$ , we obtain that (8) implies (7). ■

### C. Empirical constrained risk minimization

Though straightforward, Theorem 1 shows that, from a learning theoretic point-of-view, constrained learning is as hard as unconstrained learning. Hence, the same statistical

tools used in classical learning also apply to constrained learning. For instance, the VC dimension (Definition 2) and Rademacher complexity (Definition 3) can be directly applied to establish PACC learnability. It does not, however, address the practical challenge of learning with constraints: while it establishes *when* it is possible to do so, it does not specify *how*.

In classical learning, this is often achieved by using ERM learning rules, i.e., by approximating the expected value in (PI) by an empirical average [3], [4]. While the same can be done for (P-CSL), the resulting problem is considerably more intricate. Indeed, consider the empirical constrained risk minimization (ECRM) problem

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}^* &= \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad &\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) \leq c_i, \\ &i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P-ECRM})$$

which approximates the expectations in (P-CSL) using  $N_i$  samples  $(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}, y_{n_i}) \sim \mathcal{D}_i$ . Similarly to its unconstrained counterpart, it is possible to use the VC dimension, Rademacher complexity, and certain smoothness of the losses to show that any solution of (P-ECRM) is a PACC solution of (P-CSL). Notice, however, that (P-ECRM) is in general not a convex program in  $\theta$ , regardless of whether the losses  $\ell_i$  are convex. While unconstrained learning faces the same issue, it is exacerbated here by the presence of constraints. Indeed, though it is sometimes possible to find good approximate minimizers of  $\ell_0$  using, e.g., gradient descent rules [42]–[45], [63], even obtaining a feasible  $\theta$  for (P-ECRM) may be challenging.

Penalty-based (regularized) formulations are often used to sidestep this issue by incorporating a fixed linear combination of the constraints into the objective and solving the resulting unconstrained problem [15], [29]–[32]. Yet, whereas the generalization guarantees of classical learning theory apply to this modified objective, they say nothing about the requirements it describes. In fact, there may not even exist a set of weights (regularization parameters) that yields a solution of (P-ECRM) since strong duality need not hold for non-convex problems. Hence, this procedure need not be PACC (Definition 4) and may lead to solutions that are either infeasible or whose performance is unacceptably poor [33].

In the sequel, we propose an alternative learning rule based on empirical duality and show that it yields (near-)PACC solutions for (P-CSL). The main advantage of this approach is that it involves solving only unconstrained learning problems, leading to a more tractable and practical constrained learning algorithm than ECRM (Section IV).

### III. EMPIRICAL DUAL LEARNING

In this section, we overcome the shortcomings of (P-ECRM) by analyzing the gap between (P-CSL) and its empirical dual problem. Our goal is to quantify the loss of optimality incurred by replacing the constrained, statistical problem (P-CSL) by an

unconstrained, empirical one. Explicitly, define the *empirical Lagrangian* of (P-CSL) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}(\theta, \mu) &= \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) - c_i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

based on  $N_i$  samples  $(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}, y_{n_i}) \sim \mathcal{D}_i$ , where  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  collects the dual variables  $\mu_i$  relative to each constraint. Defining the *empirical dual function* associated to (9) as

$$\hat{d}(\mu) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \mu), \quad (10)$$

the *empirical dual problem* of (P-CSL) can be written as

$$\hat{D}^* = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \hat{d}(\mu), \quad (\hat{\text{D-CSL}})$$

where  $\mathbb{R}_+$  denotes the set of non-negative real numbers.

In the sequel, we consider that  $\hat{D}^*$  takes on values on the extended real line, i.e.,  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ . In particular, note that  $\hat{D}^* = +\infty$  whenever the constrained problem (P-ECRM) is infeasible, i.e., for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  there exists  $i$  such that  $\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) > c_i$ , in which case  $\hat{d}(\mu)$  is unbounded above. Also observe that while the form of empirical Lagrangian (9) is reminiscent of the regularized formulations often used to tackle learning under requirements, the weights (dual variables)  $\mu$  are optimization variables in  $(\hat{\text{D-CSL}})$  rather than constants (adjusted based on trial and error and cross-validation). Also note that while  $(\hat{\text{D-CSL}})$  is exactly the dual problem of (P-ECRM), their non-convex nature implies that  $\hat{D}^*$  is only a lower bound on  $\hat{P}^*$  (weak duality [33]). In contrast, we can directly relate the values of (P-CSL) and  $(\hat{\text{D-CSL}})$ . In other words,  $(\hat{\text{D-CSL}})$  is a near-PACC learner even though it cannot be used to solve (P-ECRM).

We approach this result (Theorem 2) in three steps. First, we analyze the *duality gap* of a variational version of (P-CSL) (Section III-A), showing that strong duality holds even when the  $\ell_i$  are non-convex. Explicitly, we consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^* &= \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} \left[ \ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \right] \\ \text{subject to} \quad &\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} \left[ \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) \right] \leq c_i, \\ &i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (\tilde{\text{P-CSL}})$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{H})$  denotes the convex hull of the hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  induced by the parametrization  $f_{\theta}$ . The motivation for using this variational problem lies in the observation that if the parametrization is rich enough, i.e., if  $\mathcal{H}$  is similar to  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , then we expect the solution of (P-CSL) to be close to that of  $(\tilde{\text{P-CSL}})$ . Our second step quantifies this statement by bounding the error due to the use of a non-convex hypothesis class (the *approximation gap*, Section III-B). Finally, we study the effect of approximating expectations by sample averages (the *empirical gap*, Section III-C).

To establish this result, we rely on the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1.** The losses  $\ell_i(\cdot, y)$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , are  $M$ -Lipschitz continuous functions for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

**Assumption 2.** For  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , there exists  $\zeta_i(N) \geq 0$  monotonically decreasing with  $N$  such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_n), y_n) \right| \leq \zeta_i(N), \quad (11)$$

for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$  over independent draws  $(\mathbf{x}_n, y_n) \sim \mathcal{D}_i$ .

**Assumption 3.** For each  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_i} [\gamma f_{\theta_1}(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \gamma) f_{\theta_2}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})] \leq \nu. \quad (12)$$

**Assumption 4.** There exists  $\theta', \hat{\theta}' \in \Theta$  such that  $f_{\theta'}$  and  $f_{\hat{\theta}'}$  are strictly feasible for (P-CSL) and (P-ECRM) respectively, i.e., such that, for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\theta'}(\mathbf{x}), y)] &\leq c_i - M\nu - \xi, \\ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\hat{\theta}'}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) &\leq c_i - \xi, \end{aligned}$$

with  $M$  as in Assumption 1,  $\nu$  as in (12), and  $\xi > 0$ .

While it may appear strict, Assumption 2 is simply a quantitative statement of PAC learnability. That is not to say that they are equivalent: (11) is sufficient, but in general not necessary, for PAC learnability [4]. Assumption 2 can, however, be replaced by, e.g., a bound on the VC dimension or Rademacher complexity (Definitions 2–3).

**Proposition 1.** Let  $d_{VC}$  and  $R_N$  be upper bounds on the VC dimension and Rademacher complexity of  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to  $\ell_i$  respectively. Then, (11) holds with

$$\zeta_i(N, \delta) = B \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \left[ 1 + \log \left( \frac{4(2N)^{d_{VC}}}{\delta} \right) \right]} \quad \text{or} \quad (13a)$$

$$\zeta_i(N, \delta) = 2BR_N + B \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{2N}}. \quad (13b)$$

*Proof.* See [3, eq. (3.26)] for (13a) using the fact that  $\log(x) \geq 1 - 1/x$  and [5, Thm. 3.3] for (13b). ■

Whereas Assumption 2 limits the complexity of the parametrization, Assumption 3 requires that it still be sufficiently rich, in the sense that it is a fine cover of its convex hull  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$  or equivalently, of the underlying function space it parametrizes. This occurs, for instance, when  $f_{\theta}$  is a neural network (parametrizing the space of continuous functions, see, e.g., [64]) or a finite linear combinations of kernels (parametrizing a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, RKHS [25], [65]). In both cases, the parametrizations satisfy a uniform approximation condition that is stronger than the total variation requirement in (12). Assumption 4 guarantees that the constrained problems (P-CSL) and (P-ECRM) are feasible and that all dual problems are well-posed. Observe, once again, that the losses  $\ell_i$  need not be convex.

The main result of this section is collected in the following theorem. For clarity, we restrict the remainder of this

exposition to the classification setting, i.e., to the finite  $\mathcal{Y}$  case. The regression problem is considered using an additional smoothness assumption on the losses to transform it into a classification problem, as in regression trees [59]. These results are presented in Appendix B.

**Theorem 2.** Let either

- (a) the function  $\ell_i$  be convex for  $i = 0, \dots, m$  or
- (b)  $\mathcal{Y}$  be finite, the conditional random variables  $\mathbf{x}|y$  induced by the  $\mathcal{D}_i$  be non-atomic, and  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$  be decomposable (see Section III-A).

Let  $\hat{\mu}^*$  be a solution of the dual problem ( $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL) with finite  $\hat{D}^*$ . Under Assumptions 1–4, there exists  $\hat{\theta}^* \in \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \hat{\mu}^*)$  such that, with probability  $1 - (3m+2)\delta$ ,

$$\left| P^* - \hat{D}^* \right| \leq M\nu + (1 + \Delta) \bar{\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad (14a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\hat{\theta}^*}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \zeta_i(N_i), \quad \text{for all } i, \quad (14b)$$

where  $P^*$  is the value of (P-CSL),  $\bar{\zeta} = \max_i \zeta_i(N_i)$ , and  $\Delta = \max(\|\mu^*\|_1, \|\hat{\mu}^*\|_1) \leq C$  for some constant  $C < \infty$ , where  $\mu^*$  is a solution of (D-CSL).

Theorem 2 provide joint optimality-feasibility generalization bounds for solutions of the empirical dual problem ( $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL), as long as they exist (i.e.,  $\hat{D}^* < \infty$ ). Notice that these hold even if the losses in the statistical problem are non-convex under some mild conditions on the distributions and the hypothesis class (see Section III-B for more details). In particular, it implies that near-PACC solutions of the constrained learning problem (P-CSL) can be obtained using ( $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL), an unconstrained optimization program, rather than the constrained (P-ECRM).

**Corollary 1.** Let the VC dimension and Rademacher complexity of  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to  $\ell_i$  be finite for all distributions  $f_k D_i$ . Then,  $\mathcal{H}$  is near-PACC learnable with respect to  $\ell_0, (\ell_i, c_i)$  with  $\epsilon_0 = M\nu$ .

Also observe that, while the probability of success is inversely proportional to the number of constraints  $m$ , generalization bounds are often logarithmic in  $\delta$  making this effect negligible (see Proposition 1).

The quality of the approximation in (14) is dictated by three factors: (i) the sample size, (ii) the difficulty of the learning problem, and (iii) the richness of the parametrization. Indeed, the estimation errors  $\zeta_i$  are a monotonically decreasing function of the sample size  $N$  by Assumption 2 [(i)]. In fact, if the complexity of the hypothesis class is bounded in the sense of Proposition 1, then they decrease at the classical rate of  $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ . This has a direct impact on both the near-optimality and approximate feasibility of the problem. In fact, note that when the  $\mathcal{D}_i$  denote conditional distributions of  $\mathcal{D}_0$ ,  $N_i$  can be considerably smaller than  $N_0$  and jeopardize our ability to impose constraints. This is particularly critical for classes that are minority in the sample set (see, e.g., the fairness example in Section V).

In contrast, factors (ii) and (iii) affect only the optimal value of the solution, as required by the PACC framework (Definition 4). By learning problem difficulty [(ii)], we mean the

sensitivity of the learning problem to the constraints. This is embodied by the well-known sensitivity interpretation of the dual variables [66, Sec. 5.6], which can be formalized here due to the lack of duality gap of ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) (Lemma 2). Thus,  $\Delta$  in (14a) effectively quantifies how stringent the constraints are for the learning problem in terms of how much performance could be gained by relaxing them. The remaining source of error is the approximation capability  $\nu$  of the parametrization [(iii)].

It is worth noting that richer parametrizations (smaller  $\nu$ ) typically involve more parameters, which in turn increases the complexity (e.g., VC dimension, Rademacher complexity) of their hypothesis class and, consequently,  $\zeta_i$  (see Proposition 1). This leads to the classical bias–variance trade-off from unconstrained learning. In constrained learning, however, we find a three-way trade-off that also involves the requirement difficulty. Scarce data therefore motivate not only the use of lower complexity parametrizations, but also constraint relaxations, both of which lead to solutions that generalize better.

While Theorem 2 establishes that solutions of ( $\tilde{\text{D}}\text{-CSL}$ ) generalize, it does not show *how* to obtain this a solution. While the set of Lagrangian minimizers  $\operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \hat{\mu}^*)$  always contains parameters  $\hat{\theta}^*$  that satisfy (14), it may contain others that are not approximately feasible, i.e., that violate (14b). This is not an issue when the set is a singleton (e.g., when  $\theta \mapsto \ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), \cdot)$  is strongly convex). For other cases, the algorithm in Section IV yields a sequence of parameters that induce an approximate (randomized) solution of ( $\text{P-CSL}$ ). It is worth noting that this issue, known as *primal recovery*, is a fundamental limitation of duality [REF] and that while we address it superficially, it is beyond the scope of this work.

The proof of Theorem 2 is a combination of three results that analyze the errors incurred while transforming ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) into ( $\tilde{\text{D}}\text{-CSL}$ ). Using Assumptions 1 and 3, we can then relate the values of ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) to ( $\text{P-CSL}$ ). Since some of these results may be of independent interest, we briefly discuss each of them in the sequel.

#### A. The duality gap

Define the Lagrangian of ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(\phi, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} [\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left( \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] - c_i \right) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and its associated dual function as

$$\tilde{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} L(\phi, \boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (16)$$

Since (15) is a relaxation of ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ), it holds that  $\tilde{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \tilde{P}^*$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ . The best among these lower bounds is obtained by the dual problem

$$\tilde{D}^* = \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} L(\phi, \boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (\tilde{\text{D}}\text{-CSL})$$

When the  $\ell_i$  are convex, it is well-known that this best lower bound attains the value of ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ), i.e.,  $\tilde{D}^* = \tilde{P}^*$ , under some constraint qualification (e.g., Assumption 4) [33]. The next

result shows that under mild condition on the distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , this equality holds even if the  $\ell_i$  are non-convex. We note that, besides being the first step in the construction of Theorem 2, this result has also been used in other contexts (see, e.g., [57], [67], [68]).

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose there exists  $\phi' \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y)] < c_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . If either*

- the functions  $\ell_i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , are convex or*
- $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, the conditional random variable  $\mathbf{x}|y$  induced by each of the joint distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is non-atomic, and  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  is decomposable,*

*then ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) is strongly dual, i.e.,  $\tilde{P}^* = \tilde{D}^*$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix A. ■

Hence, even if ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) is a non-convex program (e.g., in the rate-constrained learning example of Section V), it remains strongly dual under mild conditions. In particular, the conditional  $\mathbf{x}|y$  induced by the distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$  must be non-atomic, i.e., cannot contain Dirac deltas. Additionally,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  must be a *decomposable* function space, i.e., if  $\phi, \phi' \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , then for any measurable set  $\mathcal{Z}$  it holds that  $\bar{\phi} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  for

$$\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Z} \\ \phi'(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{Z} \end{cases}.$$

Lebesgue spaces (e.g.,  $L_2$  or  $L_\infty$ ) or more generally Orlicz spaces are typical examples of decomposable function spaces [69].

Condition (ii) in Proposition 2 requires  $\mathcal{Y}$  be finite, i.e., this result holds only for classification problems. We address the regression case, i.e., continuous output  $y$ , in Appendix B using a slightly stronger assumption on the continuity of the losses. The regression case can then be approximated arbitrarily well by a sequence of ever finer classification problems yielding the required strong duality result (Proposition 7). A similar approach is used to construct regression trees [59].

#### B. The approximation gap

Whereas Proposition 2 shows there is no duality gap between ( $\tilde{\text{P}}\text{-CSL}$ ) and ( $\tilde{\text{D}}\text{-CSL}$ ), the latter remains a variational, statistical problem. The next step towards the empirical dual ( $\tilde{\text{D}}\text{-CSL}$ ) is therefore to determine the error incurred from using  $f_\theta$  to approximate  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ . Namely, we consider the parametrized dual problem

$$D^* = \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad (\text{D-CSL})$$

defined in terms of the dual function

$$d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \triangleq \tilde{L}(f_\theta, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (17)$$

where  $\tilde{L}$  is the Lagrangian in (15). Notice that (D-CSL) is the exactly the dual problem of ( $\text{P-CSL}$ ). Since the minimization in (D-CSL) is performed over  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , it is straightforward that  $D^* \geq \tilde{D}^* = \tilde{P}^*$ . Yet, if the parametrization is rich enough, we would expect the gap  $D^* - \tilde{P}^*$  to be small, which allows us to bound the difference between ( $\text{P-CSL}$ )

and (D-CSL). This intuition is formalized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\mu^*$  be a solution of (D-CSL). Under the conditions of Theorem 2, there exists  $\theta^\dagger \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta, \mu^*)$  that is a feasible and the value  $D^*$  of (D-CSL) is such that*

$$P^* - M\nu \leq D^* \leq P^*, \quad (18)$$

for  $P^*$  as in (P-CSL).

*Proof.* See Appendix C.  $\blacksquare$

Despite being finite dimensional, (D-CSL) remains a statistical problem. Hence, though Proposition 3 establishes that its solutions are not only (P-CSL)-feasible but also near-optimal, the issue remains of how to solve it without explicit knowledge of the distributions  $\mathfrak{D}_i$ . Observe, however, that the objective of (D-CSL) involves an unconstrained statistical minimization problem. We have therefore done most of the heavy lifting and can now rely on the uniform bound in Assumption 2 (or Proposition 1).

### C. The empirical gap

The final step to transform (D-CSL) into the empirical dual problem ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) is to turn the statistical Lagrangian (15) into the empirical (9). The estimation error incurred in this step is detailed in the next proposition.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\hat{\mu}^*$  be a solution of ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) for finite  $D^*$ . Under the conditions of Theorem 2, there exists  $\theta^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \widehat{L}(\theta, \hat{\mu}^*)$  that is a probably approximately feasible and near-optimal solution of (P-CSL). Explicitly, it holds with probability  $1 - 3(m+1)\delta$  over the samples drawn from the distributions  $\mathfrak{D}_i$  that*

$$|D^* - \widehat{D}^*| \leq (1 + \Delta)\bar{\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i} \left[ \ell_i(f_{\hat{\theta}^*}(\mathbf{x}), y) \right] \leq c_i + \zeta_i(N_i). \quad (20)$$

where  $\bar{\zeta} = \max_i \zeta_i(N_i)$ ,  $\Delta = \max(\|\mu^*\|_1, \|\hat{\mu}^*\|_1)$ , where  $\mu^*$  is a solution of (D-CSL) and  $\hat{\mu}^*$  is a solution of ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ), and  $D^*$  and  $\widehat{D}^*$  as in (D-CSL) and ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) respectively.

*Proof.* See Appendix D.  $\blacksquare$

Theorem 2 is obtained directly from Propositions 2–4 using the triangle inequality. Observe that the order in which these transformations are applied to ( $\widehat{\text{P-CSL}}$ ) is crucial. If we were to begin by replacing the expectations with sample averages, we would obtain a variational version of (P-ECRM). However, that would require  $\mathcal{H}$  to be PAC learnable in order to derive any generalization guarantee, which is considerably stricter than the condition on  $\mathcal{H}$ . In particular, while  $\mathcal{H}$  may have finite VC dimension,  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$  generally does not. We could try to overcome this issue by parametrizing ( $\widehat{\text{P-CSL}}$ ) first, but that would simply lead us back to (P-CSL) for which strong duality does not typically hold since it is a non-convex optimization problem.

One concern that remains is that the upper bound (19) depends on the Lagrange multipliers  $\mu^*$  and  $\hat{\mu}^*$ , whose values

---

### Algorithm 1 Primal-dual constrained learning

---

1: Initialize:  $\mu^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$

2: **for**  $t = 1, \dots, T$

3: Obtain  $\theta^{(t-1)}$  such that

$$\widehat{L}(\theta^{(t-1)}, \mu^{(t-1)}) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \widehat{L}(\theta, \mu^{(t-1)}) + \rho$$

4: Evaluate constraint slacks

$$s_i^{(t-1)} = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta^{(t-1)}}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) - c_i$$

5: Update dual variables

$$\mu_i^{(t)} = \left[ \mu_i^{(t-1)} + \eta s_i^{(t-1)} \right]_+$$

6: **end**

---

are not known *a priori*. In particular, the value of  $\hat{\mu}^*$  could depend on  $N_i$  in such a way that (19) does not vanish as the number of samples grows. In that case, the empirical dual problem would not be a near-PACC learner (Definition 4). This is, however, not the case. Indeed, the existence of strictly feasible solutions (Assumption 4) implies an upper bound on the size of the Lagrange multipliers. We collect this classic result from the optimization literature the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mu^*$  and  $\hat{\mu}^*$  be optimal solutions of the dual problems (D-CSL) and ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) respectively. Then,*

$$\|\mu^*\|_1 \leq \frac{B - P^*}{\xi} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\mu}^*\|_1 \leq \frac{B - \widehat{P}^*}{\xi}. \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* We prove only the empirical case in (21) since both proofs follow the same argument. By definition of the empirical dual function (10), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D} = \widehat{d}(\hat{\mu}^*) &\leq \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\mu}_i^* \left[ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) - c_i \right], \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Using the strictly feasible point  $\hat{\theta}^*$  from Assumption 4 and the fact that  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , we further obtain

$$\widehat{D}^* \leq \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_{\hat{\theta}^*}(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) - \|\hat{\mu}^*\|_1 \xi. \quad (22)$$

To conclude, subtract (22) from  $\widehat{P}^* \geq \widehat{D}^*$  (weak duality) and use the fact that  $\ell_0$  is  $B$ -bounded to obtain (21).  $\blacksquare$

## IV. A CONSTRAINED LEARNING ALGORITHM

We have argued that ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) is preferable to (P-ECRM) for learning under requirements because it is unconstrained. That is not to say that ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) is easy to solve. But it is certainly not harder than classical ERM. In this section, we show that this is the case by describing a practical algorithm to (approximately) solve ( $\widehat{\text{D-CSL}}$ ) that only requires (approximately) solving unconstrained learning problems.

Start by noticing that the outer maximization is a convex optimization program. Indeed, the empirical dual function defined in (10) is the pointwise minimum of a set of affine functions and is therefore concave [33]. Additionally, its (sub)gradients can be easily computed by evaluating the constraint slacks at the minimizer of empirical Lagrangian  $\hat{L}$  [70, Ch. 3]. The main challenge in ( $\hat{D}$ -CSL) is therefore solving the inner minimization.

Note, however, that this minimization is a classical, unconstrained ERM problem. In fact, it is equivalent to solving an instance of a regularized learning problem. Hence, despite the (possible) non-convexity of the Lagrangian (9), local minimizers can be found using techniques such as gradient descent when the losses and parametrizations are differentiable (i.e., most common ML models). In fact, there is ample empirical and theoretical evidence that stochastic gradient descent can find good local minimizers for deep learning models such as (C)NNs [42]–[45], [63]. This is in contrast to (P-ECRM) for which even obtaining a feasible  $\theta$  can be intricate.

Algorithm 1 takes advantage of this fact to approximate the solution of the constrained learning problem (P-CSL) by alternating between minimizing the empirical Lagrangian  $\hat{L}$  from (9) with respect to  $\theta$  for fixed dual variables  $\mu$  and updating the dual variable using the resulting minimizer. Observe that step 3 implies that we can obtain a  $\rho$ -approximate minimizer of the empirical Lagrangian. The following theorem from [2, Thm. 3] shows that, if this is the case, then Algorithm 1 yields a near-optimal solution of (P-CSL). It is worth noting that this result applies to the deterministic output  $(\theta^{(T-1)}, \mu^{(T-1)})$  of Algorithm 1 and not to a randomized solution as in [8], [9], [11], [13].

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\mathcal{M}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \hat{d}(\mu)$  be the set of Lagrange multipliers of ( $\hat{D}$ -CSL) and define  $U_0 = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^*} \|\mu\|^2$ . Under the conditions of Theorem 2,  $U_0 < \infty$  and the primal-dual pair  $(\theta^{(T-1)}, \mu^{(T-1)})$  obtained after running Algorithm 1 for

$$T = \left\lceil \frac{U_0}{2\eta M\nu} \right\rceil + 1 \text{ steps}$$

with step-size

$$\eta \leq \frac{2\bar{\zeta}}{mB^2} \quad (23)$$

satisfies

$$\left| P^* - \hat{L}(\theta^{(T-1)}, \mu^{(T-1)}) \right| \leq \rho + 2M\nu + (2 + \Delta)\bar{\zeta} \quad (24)$$

with probability  $1 - (3m + 2)\delta$  over sample sets, for  $\Delta$  and  $\bar{\zeta}$  defined as in Theorem 2.

*Proof.* While [2, Thm. 3] assumes convexity of the  $\ell_i$ , the proof itself requires only strong duality, which holds here due to Proposition 2. For completeness, a revised argument is provided in Appendix E. ■

Theorem 3 bounds the error of Algorithm 1 in estimating  $P^*$ , the value of the learning problem (P-CSL). In Theorem 3, the number of iterations  $T$  and the step size  $\eta$  are chosen so as to converge to a neighborhood of size  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta\bar{\zeta} + M\nu)$ , since this is the statistical error incurred by the dual

learner (Theorem 2). Solving the empirical dual problem beyond that point will therefore not improve the quality of the estimate. It is worth noting that (24) is a guarantee on the deterministic primal-dual pair  $(\theta^{(T-1)}, \mu^{(T-1)})$  as opposed to the randomized guarantees typically provided, e.g., in fair learning [9], [11], [13].

Nevertheless, Theorem 3 only provides guarantees on approximating the value  $P^*$ , which is typically not the goal in learning. It does *not* state that  $\theta^{(T-1)}$  is near-optimal or even approximately feasible. This is an issue is not specific to constrained learning and concerns duality in general. To obtain general optimality and feasibility, it is typically necessary to rely on randomized solutions. This is the subject of the next theorem.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $\epsilon_t$  denote the empirical distribution over  $\{\theta^{(t)}\}$  generated by Algorithm 1 for  $t = 0, \dots, t - 1$ . Under the conditions of Theorem 2 and for the choice of step size (23), it holds with probability  $1 - 3(m + 1)\delta$  that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i \\ \theta \sim \epsilon_T}} [\ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P^* + \rho + (3 + \Delta)\bar{\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad (25a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i \\ \theta \sim \epsilon_T}} [\ell_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \zeta_i(N_i) + \frac{2C}{\eta T}, \quad (25b)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Whereas Theorem 3 only dealt with the value of (P-CSL), Theorem 4 provides guarantees simultaneously on the value and feasibility of a randomized solution obtained by sampling the iterates  $\{\theta^{(t)}\}$  uniformly at random. It is worth contrasting this result with those obtained in the context of rate-constrained learning. In particular, [9], [11] obtain randomized solutions by directly optimizing over the distribution over  $\Theta$ . Doing so lifts (P-CSL) to a linear program for which strong duality holds [33]. We showed in Theorem 2 (more precisely, Proposition 2) that this is, in fact, not necessary in the context of constrained learning (see Section V-A for more details on the rate-constrained case).

In fact, this is not necessary in general when considering randomized solutions. This is the approach taken by [13]. The drawback of considering only randomized solutions is that results such as Theorem 3 cannot be obtained unless the duality gap (which is defined for deterministic solutions) is not characterized as in Theorem 2. Additionally, since [13] does not consider the issue of generalization, tackling only (P-ECRM), they choose a decreasing step size  $\eta = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ . Hence, [13, Algorithm 1] (which is the same as Algorithm 1 above) converges to the solution of (P-ECRM) at a rate of  $1/\sqrt{T}$ . Here, however, since we are interested in solving (P-CSL), i.e., obtain a solution that generalizes to the population, we need not solve the dual problem exactly, which allows us to obtain better rates. Contrary to [13], we also do not assume that  $\mu^{(t)}$  is bounded.

A common point between these works and ours is that we assume access to an (approximate) oracle (step 3 of Algorithm 1). It is often the case that an iterative procedure, such as gradient descent, underlies this oracle and the cost of running this procedure until convergence (or even until a good solution is obtained) can be prohibitive. A common



alternative is to adopt an Arrow-Hurwicz-style approach in which the primal variable  $\theta^{(t)}$  and the dual variables  $\mu^{(t)}$  are updated iteratively [71]. While the convergence guarantee of Theorem 3 no longer holds in this case, good results are observed in practice by performing the primal and dual updates at different timescales, e.g., by performing step 3 once per epoch (see Section V for concrete numerical examples).

## V. APPLICATIONS

### A. Rate-constrained learning: Fair classification

Rate constraints, or more precisely probability or chance constraints, have been used in statistics at least since Neyman-Pearson [41]. In learning, they have garnered considerable attention due their central role in fairness, although they have also been used to control classifier performance, such as its coverage, precision, or accuracy [8], [9], [11], [13]. Explicitly, a rate-constrained learning problems is written as

$$P_R^* = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_0} [\ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)] \quad (\text{P-RCL})$$

subject to  $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\mathbb{I}(g_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y))] \leq c_i,$

where  $\mathbb{I}(e)$  denotes the indicator of the event  $e \geq 0$ , sometimes referred to as the Heaviside function, i.e.,  $\mathbb{I}(e) = 1$  if  $e \geq 0$  and zero otherwise. Note that the constraint in (P-RCL) is equivalent to  $\Pr_{\mathcal{D}_i}[\ell_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y) \geq 0]$ .

Rate constraints are challenging due to their non-convexity and non-differentiability. Hence, most existing generalization guarantees for rate-constrained problems apply to solutions obtained by directly optimizing a distribution over  $\Theta$  (e.g., [9], [11]). In contrast, Theorem 1 shows that if the parametrization is PAC learnable with respect to the  $\ell_i = \mathbb{I} \circ g_i$ , then (P-ECRM) is a PACC learner. In many cases, this reduces to  $\mathcal{H}$  having finite VC dimension [4]. This is the case, for instance, in binary classification problems where  $g_i(z, y) = zy$  or simply  $g_i(z, y) = z$ . Nevertheless, directly solving this non-convex, constrained optimization problem remains challenging and the dual learning guarantees from Theorem 2 do not apply to this problem due to the discontinuous nature of the indicator function. Still, we can use (4) to provide guarantees for (randomized) solutions obtained from Algorithm 1.

The main challenge to applying Algorithm 1 to (P-RCL) is that the Lagrangian of (P-RCL) is not differentiable. Indeed, the dual variable update (steps 4 and 5 in Algorithm 1) depends the availability of an approximate minimizer (step 3), which can be hard to obtain without differentiability. Here, we overcome this challenge by using a smooth surrogate of the indicator function, e.g., a sigmoid, to obtain the approximate minimizer in step 3. This is a typical approach in the statistics (e.g., logistic models) and learning literature [8], [13], [72], [73]. In particular, it was used in [13] to obtain what they call a *proxy-Lagrangian*. However, rather than using Algorithm 1, their dynamics are formulated based on Fritz-John conditions [74] and a swap-regret dual update. Their feasibility results are similar to ours, although they prove optimality only with respect to the value of the surrogate Lagrangian (27). Under a margin assumption, we provide a guarantee directly with respect to the value of (P-RCL) in Theorem 4.

Explicitly, consider the empirical dual problem of (P-RCL)

$$\hat{D}_R^* = \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \hat{d}_R(\mu), \quad (\text{D-RCL})$$

where the empirical dual function is defined as  $\hat{d}_R(\mu) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} L_R(\theta, \mu)$  for the empirical Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu) &= \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \mathbb{I}(g_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i})) - c_i \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Consider also the surrogate empirical Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta, \mu) &= \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{n_0=1}^{N_0} \ell_0(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{n_0}), y_{n_0}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \sigma(g_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i})) - c_i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

obtained by replacing the indicator functions in (26) with a surrogate  $\sigma$ , e.g., the sigmoid

$$\sigma(x) = [1 + e^{-ax}]^{-1}, \quad a \geq 1. \quad (28)$$

The advantage of using (27) is that it might be easier to optimize than (26) for an appropriate choice of surrogate. Additionally, as long as  $\hat{L}_R(\theta_\sigma^\dagger, \mu) \leq \min_{\theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu) + \rho$  (step 3 of Algorithm 1) for  $\theta_\sigma^\dagger \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta, \mu)$ , then Theorem 4 applies. In the case of the sigmoid, it is enough for the hypothesis class to exhibit a margin on the sample set. In fact, (29) below need only hold for the regularized classifiers  $\theta_R^\dagger(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu)$  and  $\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta, \mu)$ . Although the following assumption is easier stated in the more general case.

**Assumption 5.** For all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$|g_i(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i})| \geq \epsilon. \quad (29)$$

**Proposition 5.** Under Assumption 5 it holds for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  and  $\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta, \mu)$  that

$$\hat{L}_R(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) \leq \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu) + 2\|\mu\|_1(1 - \sigma(\epsilon)). \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\theta_R^\dagger(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu)$ . Then, by optimality, notice that  $\hat{L}_\sigma(\theta_R^\dagger(\mu), \mu) - \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) \geq 0$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_R(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) - \min_{\theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu) &\leq \hat{L}_R(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) - \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) \\ &+ \hat{L}_\sigma(\theta_R^\dagger(\mu), \mu) - \hat{L}_R(\theta_R^\dagger(\mu), \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of the Lagrangians in (26) and (27) then yields

$$\begin{aligned} L_R(\theta_\sigma^\dagger(\mu), \mu) - \min_{\theta} \hat{L}_R(\theta, \mu) &\leq \\ &\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\mu_i}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \left[ \sigma(g_i(f_{\theta_\sigma^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_n), y_n)) - \mathbb{I}(g_i(f_{\theta_R^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_n), y_n)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{I}(g_i(f_{\theta_\sigma^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_n), y_n)) - \sigma(g_i(f_{\theta_\sigma^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_n), y_n)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using (29) yields the desired bound. ■

To illustrate the use of rate constraints in learning, we consider a fair classification application around the COMPAS dataset [75]. The goal is to predict recidivism based on the individual’s characteristics and past offenses. Yet, while the overall recidivism rate in the dataset is 45.5%, this rate is 52.3% for African-Americans, which compose 51.4% of the data (Figure 1). Considering how this data was collected (based on arrests), we expect this disparity to be due to sampling bias. Training an unconstrained logistic classifier exacerbates this skewness. While its test accuracy is 68.5%, it predicts an overall recidivism rate of 38.4% (the actual rate on the test set is 45.7%) while maintaining the African-American group rate at 52.2% (Figure 1). This classifier was trained over a random sample containing 80% of the dataset using ADAM [76] for 1000 epochs with batch size of 128 samples, learning rate 0.2, and all other parameters as in the original paper. While we use a logistic classifier, the same results are obtained for a single layer feedforward neural network.

To overcome this issue, we impose fairness requirements during learning. More specifically, we use an asymmetric form of statistical parity that only upper bounds the difference between each protected group’s recidivism rate and the overall one. Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 P^* &= \min_{\phi \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) \right] \\
 \text{subject to} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}[\phi(\mathbf{x}) - 0.5] \mid \text{Race} = r \right] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}[\phi(\mathbf{x}) - 0.5] \right] + 0.01,
 \end{aligned} \tag{PII}$$

where  $\ell_0$  is the negative log-likelihood of the logistic distribution and  $r = \{\text{African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Other}\}$ . In other words, the final classifier is required to predict recidivism within each group at most 1% above the rate of the overall population.

We solve (PII) using a logistic classifier for  $\phi$  trained with Algorithm 1 over  $T = 1000$  epochs. For step 3, we used ADAM with the same hyperparameters as above and a sigmoidal approximation for the indicator function. Explicitly, we replaced  $\mathbb{I}[\phi(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.5]$  by  $\sigma(a(\phi(\mathbf{x}) - 0.5))$ , where  $\sigma$  denotes the sigmoid function. In our simulations, we set  $a = 8$ . After each epoch, we updated the dual variables (step 5) also using ADAM with step size 0.001. The results are shown in the last row of Figure 1.

Notice that compared to the unconstrained model, the predicted recidivism rate over the test set remains almost the same (38.9%), but the rates within each group are now more homogeneous. For instance, the rate for African-Americans is now only 1.5% above the overall one. Interestingly, the model now predicts Caucasians have a considerably higher recidivism, from 24.07% in the unconstrained model to 39.8%, which is much closer to the actual rate in the data set (39.1%). In doing so, the test accuracy of (PII) (66.3%) remains close to that of the unconstrained classifier.

Since we used a logistic classifier, we can interpret its coefficients as odds ratio to analyze the differences between the constrained and unconstrained models. The coefficients




Figure 1. Dual variable relative to the fairness constraint.




Figure 2. Dual variable relative to the fairness constraint.

with largest changes are displayed in Figure 2. Note that while the original model estimates that being African-American increases your chances of recidivism by almost 30%, the constrained model compensates for the dataset biases by instead decreasing the probability by 40%. The opposite effect occurs in the Caucasian group. The model also compensates for the individual having a large number of priors, a group composed mostly of African-Americans in the dataset (69%).

## VI. CONCLUSION

This work put forward a constrained counterpart of classical learning theory that enables requirements to be explicitly imposed during learning. Contrary to previous approaches based on hand-crafted heuristics, such as regularization or structural properties of the parametrization, it directly tackles the (non-convex) constrained statistical problem using its empirical dual, an unconstrained, finite dimensional, deterministic problem. It showed that this approach yields near-optimal solutions by bounding on the duality, parametrization, and empirical errors incurred by transforming the original learning problem (the one we want to solve) into its empirical dual (the one we can solve). It also proposed a primal-dual

algorithm that enables constrained learning by solving only unconstrained learning problem. A rate-constrained learning application was used to show the usefulness of these results. In practice, we believe that these results enable a different way of tackling learning under requirements, which is crucial for critical applications in the social, industrial, and medical fields. We also believe that many results obtained in this work can be useful to analyze other forms of learning (see [77] for examples in reinforcement learning).

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Chamon, S. Paternain, M. Calvo-Fullana, and A. Ribeiro, “The empirical duality gap of constrained statistical learning problems,” in *International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2020, pp. 2613–2616.
- [2] L. Chamon and A. Ribeiro, “Probably approximately correct constrained learning,” 2020, arXiv:2006.05487.
- [3] V. N. Vapnik, *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer, 2000.
- [4] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [5] M. Mohri, A. Rostamizadeh, and A. Talwalkar, *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2018.
- [6] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming*, 2nd ed. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2009.
- [7] T. Homem-de-Mello and G. Bayraksan, “Monte Carlo sampling-based methods for stochastic optimization,” *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 56–85, 2014.
- [8] G. Goh, A. Cotter, M. Gupta, and M. P. Friedlander, “Satisfying real-world goals with dataset constraints,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 2415–2423.
- [9] A. Agarwal, A. Beygelzimer, M. Dudik, J. Langford, and H. Wallach, “A reductions approach to fair classification,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018, pp. 60–69.
- [10] M. Donini, L. Oneto, S. Ben-David, J. S. Shawe-Taylor, and M. Pontil, “Empirical risk minimization under fairness constraints,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, pp. 2791–2801.
- [11] M. Kearns, S. Neel, A. Roth, and Z. S. Wu, “Preventing fairness gerymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018, pp. 2564–2572.
- [12] M. B. Zafar, I. Valera, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and K. P. Gummadi, “Fairness constraints: A flexible approach for fair classification,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, no. 75, pp. 1–42, 2019.
- [13] A. Cotter, H. Jiang, M. Gupta, S. Wang, T. Narayan, S. You, and K. Sridharan, “Optimization with non-differentiable constraints with applications to fairness, recall, churn, and other goals,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, no. 172, pp. 1–59, 2019.
- [14] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu, “Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [15] A. Sinha, H. Namkoong, and J. Duchi, “Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [16] H. Zhang, Y. Yu, J. Jiao, E. Xing, L. El Ghaoui, and M. Jordan, “Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 7472–7482.
- [17] J. García and F. Fernández, “A comprehensive survey on safe reinforcement learning,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1437–1480, 2015.
- [18] J. Achiam, D. Held, A. Tamar, and P. Abbeel, “Constrained policy optimization,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*. JMLR.org, 2017, pp. 22–31.
- [19] S. Paternain, M. Calvo-Fullana, L. F. Chamon, and A. Ribeiro, “Learning safe policies via primal-dual methods,” in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2019.
- [20] A. Datta, M. C. Tschantz, and A. Datta, “Automated experiments on ad privacy settings,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2015, no. 1, pp. 92–112, 2015.
- [21] M. Kay, C. Matuszek, and S. A. Munson, “Unequal representation and gender stereotypes in image search results for occupations,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ser. CHI ’15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 3819–3828. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702520>
- [22] J. Angwin, J. Larson, S. Mattu, and L. Kirchner, “Machine bias,” *ProPublica*, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>
- [23] National Transportation Safety Board, “HWY18MH010: Preliminary report,” National Transportation Safety Board, Tech. Rep., 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/HWY18MH010-prelim.pdf>
- [24] G. Wahba, *Spline models for observational data*. Siam, 1990, vol. 59.
- [25] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan, *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [26] Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, Eds., *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*. Cambridge, 2012.
- [27] T. Cour, B. Sapp, and B. Taskar, “Learning from partial labels,” *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 12, pp. 1501–1536, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1953048.2021049>
- [28] F. Yu and M.-L. Zhang, “Maximum margin partial label learning,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 106, no. 4, pp. 573–593, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-016-5606-4>
- [29] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, “Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples,” *CoRR*, 2014.
- [30] R. Berk, H. Heidari, S. Jabbari, M. Joseph, M. Kearns, J. Morgenstern, S. Neel, and A. Roth, “A convex framework for fair regression,” in *Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [31] J. Xu, Z. Zhang, T. Friedman, Y. Liang, and G. Van den Broeck, “A semantic loss function for deep learning with symbolic knowledge,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [32] S. Zhao, J. Song, and S. Ermon, “The information autoencoding family: A Lagrangian perspective on latent variable generative models,” in *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [33] D. Bertsekas, *Convex Optimization Theory*. Athena Scientific, 2009.
- [34] R. Huang, B. Xu, D. Schuurmans, and C. Szepesvári, “Learning with a strong adversary,” 2015.
- [35] U. Shaham, Y. Yamada, and S. Negahban, “Understanding adversarial training: Increasing local stability of supervised models through robust optimization,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 307, pp. 195–204, 2018.
- [36] T. Cohen and M. Welling, “Group equivariant convolutional networks,” in *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. F. Balcan and K. Q. Weinberger, Eds., vol. 48. New York, New York, USA: PMLR, 2016, pp. 2990–2999.
- [37] D. Marcos, M. Volpi, N. Komodakis, and D. Tuia, “Rotation equivariant vector field networks,” in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2017, pp. 5058–5067.
- [38] J. F. Henriques and A. Vedaldi, “Warped convolutions: Efficient invariance to spatial transformations,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, Eds., vol. 70. International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia: PMLR, 2017, pp. 1461–1469.
- [39] M. Weiler, F. A. Hamprecht, and M. Storath, “Learning steerable filters for rotation equivariant CNNs,” in *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. IEEE, 2018.
- [40] L. Ruiz, F. Gama, A. G. Marques, and A. Ribeiro, “Invariance-preserving localized activation functions for graph neural networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 127–141, 2020.
- [41] J. Neyman and E. S. Pearson, “IX. On the problem of the most efficient tests of statistical hypotheses,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 231, no. 694–706, pp. 289–337, 1933.
- [42] D. Arpit, S. Jastrzebski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, et al., “A closer look at memorization in deep networks,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*. JMLR.org, 2017, pp. 233–242.
- [43] R. Ge, J. D. Lee, and T. Ma, “Learning one-hidden-layer neural networks with landscape design,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00501*, 2017.
- [44] A. Brutzkus and A. Globerson, “Globally optimal gradient descent for a convnet with gaussian inputs,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*. JMLR.org, 2017, pp. 605–614.
- [45] M. Soltanolkotabi, A. Javanmard, and J. D. Lee, “Theoretical insights into the optimization landscape of over-parameterized shallow neural

- networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 742–769, 2018.
- [46] A. Garg and D. Roth, “Learning coherent concepts,” in *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2001, pp. 135–150.
- [47] S. Ahmed, U. Çakmak, and A. Shapiro, “Coherent risk measures in inventory problems,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 182, no. 1, pp. 226–238, 2007.
- [48] J. Luedtke and S. Ahmed, “A sample approximation approach for optimization with probabilistic constraints,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 674–699, 2008.
- [49] B. K. Pagnoncelli, S. Ahmed, and A. Shapiro, “Sample average approximation method for chance constrained programming: Theory and applications,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 142, no. 2, pp. 399–416, 2009.
- [50] L. J. Hong, Y. Yang, and L. Zhang, “Sequential convex approximations to joint chance constrained programs: A monte carlo approach,” *Operations Research*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 617–630, 2011.
- [51] W. Wang and S. Ahmed, “Sample average approximation of expected value constrained stochastic programs,” *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 515–519, 2008.
- [52] J. Hu, T. Homem-de-Mello, and S. Mehrotra, “Sample average approximation of stochastic dominance constrained programs,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 133, no. 1, pp. 171–201, 2012.
- [53] M. Branda, “Sample approximation technique for mixed-integer stochastic programming problems with expected value constraints,” *Optimization Letters*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 861–875, 2014.
- [54] V. Omelchenko and V. Kankova, “Empirical estimates in stochastic programs with probability and second order stochastic dominance constraints,” *Acta Mathematica Universitatis Comenianae*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 267–281, 2015.
- [55] V. Guigues, A. Juditsky, and A. Nemirovski, “Non-asymptotic confidence bounds for the optimal value of a stochastic program,” *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 1033–1058, 2017.
- [56] R. I. Oliveira and P. Thompson, “Sample average approximation with heavier tails i: non-asymptotic bounds with weak assumptions and stochastic constraints,” 2020, arXiv:1705.00822.
- [57] L. Chamon, Y. Eldar, and A. Ribeiro, “Functional nonlinear sparse models,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 2449–2463, 2020.
- [58] T. Kailath, A. Sayed, and B. Hassibi, *Linear estimation*. Prentice-Hall, 2000.
- [59] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer series in statistics New York, 2001, vol. 1, no. 10.
- [60] L. G. Valiant, “A theory of the learnable,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 1134–1142, 1984.
- [61] D. Haussler, “Decision theoretic generalizations of the PAC model for neural net and other learning applications,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 78–150, 1992.
- [62] P. Bartlett and S. Mendelson, “Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 3, pp. 463–482, 2002.
- [63] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, “Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03530*, 2016.
- [64] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White, “Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 359–366, 1989.
- [65] C. A. Micchelli and M. Pontil, “Learning the kernel function via regularization,” *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 6, no. Jul, pp. 1099–1125, 2005.
- [66] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [67] M. Eisen, C. Zhang, L. F. Chamon, D. D. Lee, and A. Ribeiro, “Learning optimal resource allocations in wireless systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 2775–2790, 2019.
- [68] M. Peifer, L. Chamon, S. Paternain, and A. Ribeiro, “Sparse multiresolution representations with adaptive kernels,” *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, vol. 68[1], pp. 2031–2044, 2020.
- [69] R. Rockafellar and R. Wets, *Variational Analysis*. Springer, 1998.
- [70] D. Bertsekas, *Convex optimization algorithms*. Athena Scientific, 2015.
- [71] K. Arrow, L. Hurwicz, and H. Uzawa, *Studies in linear and non-linear programming*. Stanford University Press, 1958.
- [72] E. Jang, S. Gu, and B. Poole, “Categorical reparameterization with Gumbel-softmax,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [73] C. J. Maddison, A. Mnih, and Y. W. Teh, “The concrete distribution: A continuous relaxation of discrete random variables,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [74] O. Mangasarian and S. Fromovitz, “The fritz john necessary optimality conditions in the presence of equality and inequality constraints,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 17[1], pp. 37–47, 1967.
- [75] ProPublica, “COMPAS dataset analysis,” 2016, <https://github.com/propublica/compas-analysis/>.
- [76] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980v9*, 2017.
- [77] S. Paternain, L. Chamon, M. Calvo-Fullana, and A. Ribeiro, “Constrained reinforcement learning has zero duality gap,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 7553–7563.
- [78] J. Diestel and J. J. Uhl, Jr., *Vector measures*. AMS, 1977.
- [79] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [80] A. P. Ruszczyński, *Nonlinear Optimization*. Princeton University Press, 2006.

## APPENDIX A

## PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2: THE DUALITY GAP

When the function  $\ell_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , are convex [(a)], (P-CSL) is a convex optimization problem. Under assumption (4), known in this context as Slater’s condition, its strong duality is a classical result from convex optimization theory [33, Prop. 5.3.1]. The following therefore focuses on the proof for the case in which these functions are non-convex [(b)].

Start by recalling that the dual problem ( $\tilde{D}$ -CSL) is a relaxation of its primal (P-CSL) and therefore provides a lower bound on its optimal value. Explicitly,  $D^* \leq P^*$  [33, Chap. 5]. Hence, it suffices to prove that  $D^* \geq P^*$ . We do so by showing that even though (P-CSL) is a non-convex program, the range of its cost and constraints forms a convex set under the hypotheses of the proposition. Explicitly, let the cost-constraints epigraph set be defined as

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ (s_0, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \mid \exists \phi \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq s_0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq s_i \right\}, \quad (31)$$

where the vector  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  collects the  $s_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For conciseness, we omit the distributions over which the expectations are taken whenever they can be inferred from the context. Then, the following holds:

**Lemma 2.** *If the conditional random variables  $\mathbf{x}|y$  induced by the distributions  $\mathcal{D}_i$  are non-atomic and  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, then the cost-constraints set  $\mathcal{C}$  in (31) is a non-empty convex set.*

Before proving Lemma 2, let us show how it implies strong duality for (P-CSL) by leveraging the following result from convex geometry:

**Proposition 6** (Supporting hyperplane theorem [33, Prop. 1.5.1]). *Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a nonempty convex set. If  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is not in the interior of  $\mathcal{A}$ , then there exists a hyperplane passing through  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  is in one of its closed halfspaces, i.e., there exists  $\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{0}$  such that  $\mathbf{p}^T \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{x}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}$ .*

To proceed, observe from (P-CSL) that  $(P^*, \mathbf{c})$ , where  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  collects the values of the  $c_i$ , cannot be in the interior of  $\mathcal{C}$ , otherwise there would exist  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $(P^* - \epsilon, \mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

violating the optimality of  $P^*$ . Proposition 6 then implies that there exists a non-zero vector  $(\mu_0, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  such that

$$\mu_0 s_0 + \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathbf{s} \geq \mu_0 P^* + \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathbf{c}, \quad \text{for all } (s_0, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (32)$$

Observe that the hyperplanes in (32) are defined using the same notation as the dual problem ( $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL) to foreshadow the fact that they actually span the values of the Lagrangian (15).

To proceed, note from (31) that  $\mathcal{C}$  is unbounded above, i.e., if  $(s_0, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{C}$  then  $(s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $(s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \succeq (s_0, \mathbf{s})$ . Hence, (32) can only hold if  $\mu_i \geq 0$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . Otherwise, there exists a vector in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that the left-hand side of (32) evaluates to an arbitrarily negative number, eventually violating Proposition 6. Let us now show that furthermore  $\mu_0 \neq 0$ .

Indeed, suppose  $\mu_0 = 0$ . Then (32) reduces to

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathbf{s} \geq \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathbf{c} \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}^T (\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{c}) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } (s_0, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (33)$$

Recall from Proposition 6 that there exists at least one  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \neq \mathbf{0}$  for which this inequality must hold. However, this is contradicted by the existence of the strictly feasible point  $\phi'$ . Explicitly, for every  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , there exists  $(s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$ , achieved by  $\phi'$  from the hypotheses of the proposition, such that  $s'_i < c_i$  for all  $i$ , contradicting (33).

However, if  $\mu_0 \neq 0$ , (32) can be written as

$$s_0 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^T \mathbf{s} \geq P^* + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^T \mathbf{c}, \quad \text{for all } (s_0, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{C},$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}/\mu_0$ , which from the definition of  $\mathcal{C}$  in (31) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mu}_i (\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] - c_i) \geq P^*, \quad (34)$$

for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ . Note, however, that the left-hand side of (34) is the Lagrangian (15), i.e., (34) implies that  $L(\phi, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \geq P^*$ . In particular, this holds for the minimum of  $L(\phi, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ , implying that  $D^* \geq P^*$  and therefore, that strong duality holds for (P-CSL). ■

All that remains now is proving that the cost-constraint set  $\mathcal{C}$  in (31) is convex.

*Proof of Lemma 2.* This proof follows along the lines of [57]. Let  $(s_0, \mathbf{s}), (s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$  be arbitrary points achieved for  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ , i.e., for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq s_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq s'_i. \quad (35)$$

It suffices then to show that  $\lambda(s_0, \mathbf{s}) + (1-\lambda)(s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  to obtain that  $\mathcal{C}$  is convex. Equivalently, we must obtain  $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq \lambda s_i + (1-\lambda)s'_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, m, \quad (36)$$

for all  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ . To do so, we rely on the following classical theorem about the range of non-atomic vector measures:

**Theorem 5** (Lyapunov's convexity theorem [78, Chap. IX, Cor. 5]). *Let  $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a finite dimensional vector measure over the measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ . If  $\mathbf{v}$  is non-atomic, then its range is convex, i.e., the set  $\{\mathbf{v}(\mathcal{Z}) : \mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{B}\}$  is a convex set.*

To see how Theorem 5 allows us to construct the desired  $\phi_\lambda$ , let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Define the  $2|\mathcal{Y}|(m+1) \times 1$  vector measure  $\mathbf{p}$  such that for every set  $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{B}$  we have

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) d\mathbf{x} \\ \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y) f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) d\mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix}_{i=0, \dots, m; y \in \mathcal{Y}}, \quad (37)$$

where  $f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)$  denotes the conditional density of  $\mathbf{x}$  given  $y$  induced by the joint distributions  $\mathfrak{D}_i^1$ . Hence, the entries of  $\mathbf{p}$  contain integrals of the losses  $\ell_i$  of  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  with respect to every possible value of  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Immediately, we note that  $\mathbf{p}(\emptyset) = \mathbf{0}$  and

$$\mathbf{p}(\Omega) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \\ \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \end{bmatrix}_{i=0, \dots, m; y \in \mathcal{Y}}. \quad (38)$$

Due to the additive property of the Lebesgue integral,  $\mathbf{p}$  in (37) is a proper vector measure. What is more, the  $\ell_i$  are bounded functions, so the fact that  $\mathbf{x}|y$  is non-atomic implies that  $\mathbf{p}$  is also non-atomic. Hence, from Theorem 5, there exists a set  $\mathcal{T}_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$  such that

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathcal{T}_\lambda) = \lambda \mathbf{p}(\Omega) + (1-\lambda) \mathbf{p}(\emptyset) = \lambda \mathbf{p}(\Omega), \quad (39)$$

for  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, it holds that  $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$  and by additivity we obtain

$$\mathbf{p}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_\lambda) = (1-\lambda) \mathbf{p}(\Omega). \quad (40)$$

From (39) and (40), we then construct  $\phi_\lambda$  as

$$\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi(\mathbf{x}), & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda \\ \phi'(\mathbf{x}), & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_\lambda \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

It is straightforward from the decomposability hypothesis on  $\mathcal{H}$ , that  $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ . We claim that it also satisfies (36).

To see this is the case, use the construction in (41) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] &= \int_{\mathcal{T}_\lambda} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y) f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Note from (37), that these integral can be written as entries of the vector measure  $\mathbf{p}$ , namely

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] = [\mathbf{p}(\mathcal{T}_\lambda)]_{\phi; i; y} + [\mathbf{p}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_\lambda)]_{\phi'; i; y}. \quad (42)$$

In (42), we use the notation  $[\mathbf{p}]_{\phi; i; y}$  to denote the entry of  $\mathbf{p}$  relative to the function  $\phi$ , the  $i$ -th loss, and the variable  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . From (39) and (40), we know that (42) evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] &= [\lambda \mathbf{p}(\Omega)]_{\phi; i; y} + [(1-\lambda) \mathbf{p}(\Omega)]_{\phi'; i; y} \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \\ &\quad + (1-\lambda) \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y) | y], \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>We assume here that these density exist only to simplify the notation. The integrals in (37) can be taken against the conditional (Radon-Nikodym) measures as long as the law of  $\mathbf{x}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of  $y$  [79].

for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Use the tower (total expectation) property, we immediately conclude that for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y)] &= \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \lambda \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \right] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y)], \end{aligned}$$

which using (35) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq \lambda s_i + (1 - \lambda) s'_i.$$

Hence, there exists  $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$  such that (36) holds for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  and  $(s_0, \mathbf{s}), (s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$ . The set  $\mathcal{C}$  is therefore convex. Moreover, the strictly feasible  $\phi'$  from the hypotheses of the proposition implies that  $\mathcal{C}$  is not be empty. ■

## APPENDIX B

### DUALITY GAP FOR REGRESSION

The Lyapunov convexity theorem (Theorem 5) turns out to be quite sensitive to the hypothesis that the vector measure takes values in a finite dimensional Banach space [78, Ch. IX]. When  $\mathcal{Y}$  is compact, we can overcome this issue without resorting to super-atomless (saturated) spaces by assuming the losses are continuous in  $y$  and slicing  $\mathcal{Y}$  to approximate regression by a sequence of increasingly fine classification problems. Once again, we consider the measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$  where  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Proposition 7.** *Consider the dual problem ( $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL). Under assumptions 1 and 4, (P-CSL) is strongly dual, i.e.,  $P^* = D^*$ , if  $\mathcal{Y}$  is compact, the conditional distributions  $\mathbf{x}|y$  induced by the  $\mathfrak{D}_i$  are non-atomic, and  $y \mapsto \ell_i(\phi(\cdot), y)f_i(\cdot | y)$  is continuous in the total variation topology for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ , where  $f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)$  denotes the density of the conditional random variable induced by  $\mathfrak{D}_i$ . Explicitly, for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $|y - \tilde{y}| \leq \delta$  it holds that*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} |\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) - \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{y})f_i(\mathbf{x} | \tilde{y})| d\mathbf{x} \leq \epsilon,$$

The proof of Proposition 7 follows that of the finite  $\mathcal{Y}$  case in Appendix A by replacing Lemma 2 with

**Lemma 3.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 7, the cost-constraints set  $\mathcal{C}$  in (31) is a non-empty convex set.*

*Proof of Lemma 3.* Without loss of generality, assume  $\mathcal{Y} = [0, 1]$ . Once again, let  $(s_0, \mathbf{s}), (s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$  be achieved by  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ . Our goal, as before, is to construct  $\phi_\lambda$  such that (36) holds for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

To do so, fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and let  $\delta$  be such that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} |\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) - \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{y})f_i(\mathbf{x} | \tilde{y})| d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

for all  $|y - \tilde{y}| \leq \delta$ . The continuity hypothesis guarantees that such a  $\delta$  exists. Then, partition  $\mathcal{Y}$  into  $\lceil 1/\delta \rceil$  intervals  $\mathcal{I}_k = [(k-1)\delta, k\delta]$  and let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = \left\{ \tilde{y}_k \triangleq (k - 1/2)\delta \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, \lceil 1/\delta \rceil \right\}. \quad (43)$$

To proceed, construct the  $2^{|\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}|} (m+1) \times 1$  vector measure

$$\mathbf{p}_\epsilon(\mathcal{Z}) = \left[ \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{y})f_i(\mathbf{x} | \tilde{y})d\mathbf{x} \right]_{i=0, \dots, m; \tilde{y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}} \quad (44)$$

and, using the non-atomicity of  $\mathbf{p}_\epsilon$ , obtain from Theorem 5 a set  $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon} \in \mathcal{B}$  such that

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}) = \lambda \mathbf{p}_\epsilon(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{p}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}) = (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{p}_\epsilon(\Omega). \quad (45)$$

From (45), we construct  $\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon}$  as

$$\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi(\mathbf{x}), & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon} \\ \phi'(\mathbf{x}), & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon} \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is decomposable, we again have  $\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon} \in \mathcal{H}$ . Let us show that it satisfies (36) up to an additive error  $\epsilon$ .

Indeed, notice from (46) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon}(\mathbf{x}), y)] &= \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon}(\mathbf{x}), y) | y] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)d\mathbf{x} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)d\mathbf{x} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Focusing on the first expectation, we start by constructing a simple function approximation of the integrand using the intervals from (43). From the continuity of  $\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)$ , we then obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)d\mathbf{x} \right] &\leq \\ \sum_{k=0}^{|\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}|} \mathbb{E}_y [\mathbb{I}[y \in \mathcal{I}_k]] \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{y}_k)f_i(\mathbf{x} | \tilde{y}_k)d\mathbf{x} &+ \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Notice from the definition of the vector measure in (44) that the value of the integrals in (48) are entries of the vector  $\mathbf{p}_\epsilon(\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon})$ . Using the property of  $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}$  in (45), we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)d\mathbf{x} \right] &\leq \\ \lambda \sum_{k=0}^{|\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}|} \mathbb{E}_y [\mathbb{I}[y \in \mathcal{I}_k]] \int \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{y}_k)f(\mathbf{x} | \tilde{y}_k)d\mathbf{x} &+ \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Using once again the continuity hypothesis and the fact that since  $\mathfrak{D}_i$  is a probability measure,  $\sum_{k=0}^{|\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}|} \mathbb{E}_y [\mathbb{I}[y \in \mathcal{I}_k]] = 1$ , yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)f_i(\mathbf{x} | y)d\mathbf{x} \right] &\leq \\ \leq \lambda \mathbb{E}_y [\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) | y]] &+ \frac{(1 + \lambda)\epsilon}{3} \\ = \lambda \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] &+ \frac{(1 + \lambda)\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

A similar argument yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_y \left[ \int_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\lambda, \epsilon}} \ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y) f_i(\mathbf{x} | y) d\mathbf{x} \right] &\leq \\ &\leq (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi'(\mathbf{x}), y)] + \frac{(2 - \lambda)\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Combining (50) and (51) in (47), we obtain that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon} \in \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_{\lambda, \epsilon}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq \lambda s_i + (1 - \lambda)s'_i + \epsilon, \quad (52)$$

for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$ .

Suppose now that there is no  $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq \lambda s_i + (1 - \lambda)s'_i$ . Then, there exists  $\tau > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] > \lambda s_i + (1 - \lambda)s'_i + \tau$$

for  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ . However, this violates (52) for  $\epsilon = \tau$  leading to a contradiction. Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is closed, we therefore obtain that for all  $(s_0, \mathbf{s}), (s'_0, \mathbf{s}') \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}$  such that (36), showing that  $\mathcal{C}$  is convex. The strictly feasible  $\phi'$  from assumption 4 implies that  $\mathcal{C}$  is also not empty. ■

## APPENDIX C

### PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3: THE APPROXIMATION GAP

We first prove that there exists a  $f_{\theta^\dagger}$  feasible for (P-CSL) and then bound the gap between  $D^*$  and  $P^*$ .

**Feasibility.** The proof relies on the following lemma characterizing the superdifferential of the dual function (17). Explicitly, we say  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a *supergradient* of  $d$  at  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  if

$$d(\boldsymbol{\mu}') \leq d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) + \mathbf{p}^T(\boldsymbol{\mu}' - \boldsymbol{\mu}), \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{\mu}' \in \mathbb{R}_+^m. \quad (53)$$

The set of all supergradients of  $d$  at  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is called the *superdifferential* of  $d$  at  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  and is denoted  $\partial d(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ . Additionally, let  $\Theta^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  for the Lagrangian defined in (17) and define the constraint slack vector

$$\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), y)] - c_i \right]_+ \right]_i. \quad (54)$$

For clarity, we now omit the distribution  $\mathfrak{D}_i$  over which the expected value is taken. The following is sometimes known as Danskin's theorem.

**Lemma 4.** *Under Assumption 1, it holds that*

$$\partial d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \operatorname{conv} \left( \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger \in \Theta^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger) \right). \quad (55)$$

*Proof.* See, e.g., [80, Thm. 2.87], noting that  $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \cdot)$  is affine for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ ,  $L(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  is continuous for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  (Assumption 1), and  $\Theta$  is compact. Hence, we meet conditions (i)–(iii) of the theorem. Considering that  $d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = -\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} -L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  yields the desired result. ■

The proof then follows by contradiction. Indeed, suppose that all elements of  $\Theta^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  are infeasible for (P-CSL). Then, for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger \in \Theta^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  there exists  $i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger)$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_{i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger)}(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}), y)] - c_{i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger)} > 0$ . From Lemma 4,

$\mathbf{0} \notin \partial d(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$ . However, this contradicts the optimality of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ . Hence, there must be  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^\dagger \in \Theta^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  feasible for (P-CSL).

**Near-optimality.** The upper bound is trivial from weak duality [66]. For the lower bound, consider the variational problem

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_p^* &= \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_0} [\ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ \text{subject to } &\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i} [\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i - M\nu, \quad (\text{PIII}) \\ &i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

and let  $\tilde{\phi}_p^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  be a solution. Notice from Proposition 2 and Assumption 4 that (PIII) is strongly dual, so that

$$\tilde{P}_p^* = \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \tilde{L}_p(\phi, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \tilde{L}_p(\tilde{\phi}_p^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_p^*), \quad (56)$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_p^*$  achieves the maximum in (56) for the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_p(\phi, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \left[ \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)] - c_i + M\nu \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

For clarity, we omit the distribution  $\mathfrak{D}_i$  over which the expected values are taken.

To proceed, note from (D-CSL) that

$$D^* \geq \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m.$$

Immediately, we obtain that

$$D^* \geq \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_p^*) \geq \min_{\phi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \tilde{L}(\phi, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_p^*), \quad (58)$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \operatorname{conv}(\mathcal{H})$ . Using the strong duality of (PIII), (58) yields

$$D^* \geq \tilde{P}_p^* = \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y)]. \quad (59)$$

To obtain the lower bound in (18), suffices it to show that  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y)] \geq P^* - M\nu$ .

Explicitly, it holds from Assumptions 1 and 3 that there exists  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^* \in \Theta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell_i(f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \ell_i(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y) - \ell_i(f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*}(\mathbf{x}), y) \right| \right] \\ &\leq M \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right] \leq M\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Since  $\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x})$  is feasible for the perturbed (PIII), (60) implies that  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*$  is feasible for (P-CSL). By optimality,  $P^* \leq \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*}(\mathbf{x}), y)]$ . Back in (59), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} D^* &\geq \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ &\geq P^* + \mathbb{E}[\ell_0(\tilde{\phi}_p^*(\mathbf{x}), y) - \ell_0(f_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_p^*}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \\ &\geq P^* - M\nu, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality stems from (60). ■

## APPENDIX D

## PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4: THE ESTIMATION GAP

**Feasibility.** The proof follows by first showing that  $\hat{\theta}^*$  must be feasible for (P-ECRM) using the same argument as in Section C. Then, leveraging the fact that  $\mathcal{H}$  is PAC learnable (Assumption 3), we can apply generalization bounds from classical learning theory.

Again by contradiction, suppose that all elements of  $\hat{\Theta}^\dagger(\hat{\mu}^*)$  are infeasible for (P-ECRM). Then, for all  $\hat{\theta}^\dagger \in \hat{\Theta}^\dagger(\hat{\mu}^*)$  there exists  $i$  such that

$$\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\hat{\theta}^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) > c_i,$$

for  $(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}, y_{n_i}) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i$ . Then, from Lemma 4,  $\mathbf{0} \notin \partial d(\hat{\mu}^*)$ , which contradicts the optimality of  $\hat{\mu}^*$ . Hence, there must be  $\hat{\theta}^\dagger \in \hat{\Theta}^\dagger(\hat{\mu}^*)$  feasible for (P-ECRM).

From the uniform bound in Assumption 2, it holds with probability  $1 - \delta$  over the data that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) + \zeta_i(N_i) \quad (61)$$

for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

**Near-optimality.** Let  $\mu^*$  and  $\hat{\mu}^*$  be solutions of (D-CSL) and ( $\hat{D}$ -CSL) respectively and consider the set of dual minimizers

$$\Theta^\dagger(\mu) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta, \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Theta}^\dagger(\hat{\mu}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \hat{\mu})$$

for the Lagrangians defined in (17) and (9) respectively. Using the optimality  $\mu^*$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} D^* - \hat{D}^* &= \min_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta, \mu^*) - \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \hat{\mu}^*) \\ &\leq \min_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta, \mu^*) - \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\theta, \mu^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}^\dagger \in \hat{\Theta}^\dagger(\mu^*)$  is suboptimal for  $L(\theta, \mu^*)$ , we get

$$D^* - \hat{D}^* \leq L(\hat{\theta}^\dagger, \mu^*) - \hat{L}(\hat{\theta}^\dagger, \mu^*). \quad (62)$$

Using a similar argument yields

$$D^* - \hat{D}^* \geq L(\theta^\dagger, \hat{\mu}^*) - \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \hat{\mu}^*) \quad (63)$$

for  $\theta^\dagger \in \Theta^\dagger(\hat{\mu}^*)$ . Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |D^* - \hat{D}^*| &\leq \max \left\{ \left| L(\hat{\theta}^\dagger, \mu^*) - \hat{L}(\hat{\theta}^\dagger, \mu^*) \right|, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| L(\theta^\dagger, \hat{\mu}^*) - \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \hat{\mu}^*) \right| \right\} \quad (64) \end{aligned}$$

Using the empirical bound from Assumption 2, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |L(\theta, \mu) - \hat{L}(\theta, \mu)| &\leq \zeta_0(N_0) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \zeta_i(N_i) \\ &\leq (1 + \|\mu\|_1) \max_i \zeta_i(N_i), \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

holds uniformly over  $\theta$  with probability  $1 - (m+1)\delta$ .

**Union bound.** To conclude, we use the union bound to combine (61) for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  with (64) and (65). Doing so, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |D^* - \hat{D}^*| &\leq (1 + \Delta) \bar{\zeta} \\ \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathfrak{D}_i} [\ell_i(f_{\hat{\theta}^*}(\mathbf{x}), y)] &\leq c_i + \zeta_i(N_i) \end{aligned}$$

occur simultaneously with probability at least  $1 - (3m+2)\delta$  for  $\bar{\zeta} = \max_i \zeta_i(N_i)$  and  $\Delta = \max(\|\mu^*\|_1, \|\hat{\mu}^*\|_1)$ . ■

## APPENDIX E

## PROOF OF THEOREM 3

**Deterministic duality gap.** We proceed by proving that, for all  $\beta > 0$ ,

$$\hat{D}^* - \rho - \eta \frac{mB^2}{2} - \beta \leq \hat{L}(\theta^{(T)}, \mu^{(T)}) \leq \hat{D}^* + \rho, \quad (66)$$

from which we obtain (24) by using the near-PACC bound on  $\hat{D}^*$  from Theorem 2 and choosing  $\beta = M\nu$  and  $\eta$  as in the statement of the theorem. Start by noticing from the definition of the empirical dual function  $\hat{d}$  in (10), that the upper bound in (66) holds trivially from the fact that  $\hat{d}(\mu) \leq \hat{D}^*$  for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ . Thus, from the fact that  $\theta^{(t)}$  is an approximate minimizer of the empirical Lagrangian  $\hat{L}$  (step 3 of Algorithm 1), we obtain that

$$\hat{L}(\theta^{(t)}, \mu^{(t)}) \leq \hat{D}^* + \rho, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (67)$$

For the lower bound, we rely on the following relaxation of Dankin's classical theorem [70, Ch. 3]:

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\theta^\dagger$  be a  $\rho$ -approximate minimizer of the empirical Lagrangian (9) at  $\mu$ , i.e.,*

$$\hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \mu) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \hat{L}(\theta, \mu) + \rho,$$

for  $\rho \geq 0$ . Then, the constraint slacks evaluate at  $\theta^\dagger$

$$s_i(\theta^\dagger) = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\theta^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) - c_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (68)$$

are approximate supergradients of the dual function (10). Explicitly,

$$\hat{d}(\mu) \geq \hat{d}(\mu') + \sum_{i=1}^m (\mu_i - \mu'_i) s_i(\theta^\dagger) - \rho \quad (69)$$

for all  $\mu' \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ .

*Proof.* Recalling from (10) that  $\hat{d}(\mu) = \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \hat{L}(\theta, \mu)$ , we obtain from (5) that

$$\hat{d}(\mu') \leq \hat{d}(\mu') + \hat{d}(\mu) - \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \mu) + \rho. \quad (70)$$

Additionally, we can upper bound (70) by noticing that  $\hat{d}(\mu') \leq \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \mu')$  for the suboptimal  $\theta^\dagger$ , yielding

$$\hat{d}(\mu') \leq \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \mu') + \hat{d}(\mu) - \hat{L}(\theta^\dagger, \mu) + \rho. \quad (71)$$

From (9), notice that the first term of the Lagrangians in (71) are identical and cancel out, leading to (69). ■



To proceed, let  $\mathcal{M}^*$  be the set of solutions of the dual problem ( $\widehat{D}$ -CSL), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (72)$$

We show next that for at least  $O(1/\beta)$  steps, the distance

$$U_t = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^*\|^2 \quad (73)$$

decreases by more than  $O(\beta)$ . To do so, it is convenient to collect the constraint slacks from step 4 of Algorithm 1 into a vector  $\mathbf{s}^{(t)} = [s_i^{(t)}]_{i=1, \dots, m}$ . Then, using the update in Algorithm 1 (step 5), we write (73) as

$$U_t = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \left[ \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} + \eta \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} \right]_+ - \boldsymbol{\mu}^* \right\|^2.$$

Since  $\mathcal{M}^* \subset \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , we can use the non-expansiveness of the projection  $[\cdot]_+$  [33] to obtain

$$U_t \leq \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} + \eta \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^* \right\|^2. \quad (74)$$

To proceed, expand the norms in (74) to get

$$U_t \leq \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left[ \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^* \right\|^2 + 2\eta \left( \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^* \right)^T \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} + \eta^2 \left\| \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} \right\|^2 \right].$$

Using Lemma 5 and the fact that the  $\ell_i$  are bounded, we then obtain

$$U_t \leq U_{t-1} + 2\eta \left[ \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)}) - \hat{D}^* + \rho \right] + m\eta^2 B^2.$$

Since  $\hat{D}^* = \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*$ , the second term no longer depends on the choice of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ , so that the infimum applies only to the distance between  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ , which we write as  $U_{t-1}$  using the definition in (73). Solving this recursion yields

$$U_t \leq U_0 + 2\eta \sum_{t=0}^{t-1} \Delta_t, \quad (75)$$

for

$$\Delta_t = \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}) - \hat{D}^* + \rho + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (76)$$

To conclude, notice that  $\hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \hat{D}^*$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ . Hence, when  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}$  is sufficiently far from the optimum and the step size  $\eta$  is sufficiently small, we have  $\Delta_t < 0$  and (75) shows that the distance to the optimum  $U_t$  decreases. Formally, fix a precision  $\beta > 0$  and let  $(T-1) = \min\{t \mid \Delta_t > -\beta\}$ . Then, from the definition of  $\Delta_t$  we obtain the desired lower bound in (66) by noting that

$$\Delta_{T-1} > -\beta \Leftrightarrow \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T-1)}) > \hat{D}^* - \rho - \eta \frac{mB^2}{2} - \beta$$

and that  $\hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T-1)}) \leq \hat{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T-1)})$ . What is more, (75) yields

$$T \leq \frac{U_0}{2\eta\beta} + 1 = O(\beta^{-1}).$$

## APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 4

We will proceed by showing that the randomized solution is feasible and near-optimal for the empirical problem (P-ECRM). We can then leverage Assumption 2 and Propositions 3 and 4 and apply the union bound to obtain the result with respect to the statistical losses in (25). We start by proving (25b) and then proceed with (25a).

**Randomized feasibility.** We begin with a technical lemma showing that the  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}$  generated by Algorithm 1 do not stray too far away from the set of Lagrange multipliers.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}^*$  denote the set of solutions of the dual problem ( $\widehat{D}$ -CSL), i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , and  $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}\}$  denote the sequence of dual variables generated by Algorithm 1. Then, under Assumption 4, there exists a constant  $C < \infty$  such that*

$$\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \right\| \leq C. \quad (77)$$

*Proof.* Start by defining the set of approximate Lagrange multipliers

$$\mathcal{D} \triangleq \left\{ \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \mid \hat{D}^* - \hat{d}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \rho + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2} \right\}. \quad (78)$$

This set is not empty since there exists at least one  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  that achieves  $\hat{D}^*$ . Indeed, while ( $\widehat{D}$ -CSL) optimizes over the open set  $\mathbb{R}_+^m$ , Lemma 1 shows that the existence of a strictly feasible point means it is equivalent to a problem over a compact set ( $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}^*\|_1$  is bounded). The remainder of the proof is separated in the cases  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \notin \mathcal{D}$ .

For  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}$ , note that the same argument used to prove Lemma 1 yields  $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq (B - \hat{D}^*)/\xi \triangleq C$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , it holds that

$$\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \right\| \leq C. \quad (79)$$

For the  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \notin \mathcal{D}$  case, denote by  $\mathcal{B}_{\eta B}$  the  $l_2$ -ball centered at the origin with radius  $\eta B$  and by  $\oplus$  the Minkowski sum. Observe that if  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} \in \mathcal{D}$ , then  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{B}_{\eta B}$ . This is due to the fact that, since the losses are bounded,  $s_i^{(t-1)} \leq B$  in step 5 of Algorithm 1. This means that once the iterates step into  $\mathcal{D}$ , they must have bounded norm once they step outside. Hence, we can consider without loss of generality the case in which  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} \notin \mathcal{D}$ . Indeed, after  $T_0 = \min\{t \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , the first iterate *outside*  $\mathcal{D}$  will have bounded norm and the study of the sequence reduces to the case in which  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} \notin \mathcal{D}$ .

To proceed, let us therefore study the sequence  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t \wedge T_0)}$ , where  $a \wedge b$  denotes the minimum between  $a$  and  $b$ . Notice from (76) that  $\Delta_t < 0$  for any  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \notin \mathcal{D}$ , so that (75) implies

$$\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t \wedge T_0)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \right\| < \inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \right\|. \quad (80)$$

Given that  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$  in Algorithm 1, the right-hand side reduces to  $\inf_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^*\| \leq C$ , since  $\mathcal{M}^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . Combining (79) with (80) yields the desired result. ■

Let us now show that for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \epsilon_T} \left[ \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i}) - c_i \right] \leq \frac{2C}{\eta T}, \quad (81)$$

which reduces to

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_i^{(t)} \leq \frac{2C}{\eta T}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (82)$$

for  $s_i^{(t)}$  defined in step 4 of Algorithm 1 and the constant  $C$  from Lemma 6. To do so, start by noticing from step 5 of Algorithm 1 that for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  it holds that

$$\mu_i^{(t)} \geq \mu_i^{(t-1)} + \eta s_i^{(t-1)}, \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Solving the recursion and recalling that  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$  then yields

$$\mu_i^{(t)} \geq \eta \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} s_i^{(j)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_i^{(t)} \leq \frac{\mu_i^{(t)}}{\eta T}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Since  $\mu_i^{(t)} \geq 0$ , it holds for any  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{M}^*$  that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} s_i^{(t)} \leq \frac{|\mu_i^{(T)} - \hat{\mu}_i^*| + |\hat{\mu}_i^*|}{\eta T} \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^*\| + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^*\|}{\eta T}.$$

Applying Lemma 6 yields (81). Applying the uniform empirical bound from Assumption 2 yields that for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \epsilon_T}} [\ell_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq c_i + \frac{2C}{\eta T} + \zeta_i(N_i). \quad (83)$$

**Randomized optimality.** As in the feasibility proof, we begin with a lemma bounding the ergodic complementary slackness for the joint sequence  $\{(s_i^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)})\}$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Consider sequence  $\{(s_i^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)})\}$  for  $t = 0, \dots, T-1$  obtained from Algorithm 1. It holds that*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{(t)} s_i^{(t)} \right] \geq -\eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (84)$$

*Proof.* To simplify the notation, define the vector  $\mathbf{s}^{(t)} = [s_i^{(t)}]$  that collects the slacks from step 4 of Algorithm 1. Then, the complementary slackness can be written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{(t)} s_i^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)\top} \mathbf{s}^{(t)},$$

where  $\top$  denotes the transposition operation. To bound (84), we once again use the update in step 5 of Algorithm 1 together with the non-expansiveness of the projection to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}\|^2 &\leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)} + \eta \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} \right\|^2 \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)}\|^2 + \eta^2 \|\mathbf{s}^{(t-1)}\|^2 + 2\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t-1)\top} \mathbf{s}^{(t-1)} \end{aligned}$$

Applying this relation recursively from  $T$  and using the fact that the losses are bounded (and, thus, so are the constraint slacks  $s_i$ ) and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ , we obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T)}\|^2 \leq T\eta^2(mB^2) + 2\eta \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(j)\top} \mathbf{s}^{(j)} \quad (85)$$

Noticing that  $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(T)}\|^2 \geq 0$  and dividing (85) by  $T$  yields the desired result.  $\blacksquare$

With Lemma 7 in hand, we can now proceed with bounding the suboptimality of the randomized solution. To do so, we once again start by bounding the empirical objective. Explicitly, let  $\hat{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \triangleq \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n_i=1}^{N_i} \ell_0(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{n_i}), y_{n_i})$  and notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_T} [\hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

By adding and subtracting  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{(t)} s_i^{(t)}$  and recognizing the expression for the empirical Lagrangian (9), we then obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_T} [\hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \hat{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}) - \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^{(t)} s_i^{(t)}.$$

Using Lemma 7 and the approximate minimizer property of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$  (step 3 of Algorithm 1), we then obtain the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_T} [\hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \hat{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}) + \rho \right] + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (86)$$

Observe that the minimum in (86) is the empirical dual function (10) and by the definition of the empirical dual problem ( $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ -CSL) it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_T} [\hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq \hat{D}^* + \rho + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (87)$$

To conclude the proof, use Propositions 3 and 4 to bound  $\hat{D}^*$  in (87) and get that with probability  $1 - 2(m+1)\delta$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_T} [\hat{F}_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \leq P^* + (1 + \Delta)\bar{\zeta} + \rho + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (88)$$

Once again using the uniform empirical bound from Assumption 2 yields that, with probability at least  $1 - (2m+3)\delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \epsilon_T}} [\ell_0(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), y)] \leq P^* + \rho + (2 + \Delta)\bar{\zeta} + \eta \frac{mB^2}{2}. \quad (89)$$

**Union bound.** Using the union bound to combine (83) and (89) and the choice of step size in (23) concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$